

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-27, which are all of the pending claims, under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over the prior art, principally the prior art discussed in the Background section of this application. More specifically, Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 17, 18, 21, 26 and 27 were rejected as being unpatentable over that prior art alone; and Claims 2-4, 6, 9-11, 13, 15, 16, 19 and 22-25 were rejected as being unpatentable over the prior art discussed in the application in view of U.S. Patent 5,812,768 (Page, et al.).

It is noted that the rejection of Claim 20 was not expressly discussed in the Office Action. Applicants will proceed, however, on the basis that this claim was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 either over the prior art discussed in the Background section of the application, or over that prior art in combination with Page, et al.

The present invention, generally, relates to the generation of interfaces to computer programs in different environments. As discussed in detail in the present application, the present invention provides a mapping from a program written in a first language to a program written in another language. The invention creates an interface which handles that mapping, and in particular, the interface translates data types from the first language to the second language, formats data from the first language to the second language, and handles other matters necessary for the sharing of data between different programming environments.

Tools for sharing data between different programming environments are, of course, known, and two of these tools are discussed in the Background section of the application. For instance, a first tool, CICON, provides access to various transaction

applications, but does not optimally allow access to all legacy business applications. A second tool, CICS, allows access to COBOL transactions, but uses a static definition of the data to be exchanged.

One important difference between these prior art tools and the present invention is that this invention handles the dynamic nature of the message stream. For example, the preferred embodiment of the invention supports the dynamic composing and reading of data messages exchanged between an interfacing program and an operating program.

As will be appreciated, this ability of this invention to handle the dynamic nature of the message stream is of utility because, among other advantages, it provides for a more immediate transfer of a continuing stream of data.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and they are not believed to be any more pertinent than the prior art discussed in the Background section of the application. For instance, Page was cited for its disclosure of accessing an IMS transaction via a message interface; however, this reference also fails to teach the above-discussed dynamic aspect of the invention.

Independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 17, 22, 24 and 26 are being amended to emphasize this aspect of the invention. In particular, Claims 1, 8 and 22 are herein being amended to include the limitation that the program interface provides means for dynamically converting data between an IMS transaction and a program in another environment, and Claims 17 and 26 are being amended to set forth means for dynamically converting data between the IMS transaction and that other program. Also, independent Claims 15 and 24 are being amended to indicate that the means for scanning the IMS transaction produces dynamically a data description of that transaction. Claim 21, it may be noted,

incorporates the limitations of Claim 1.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 8, 15, 17, 21, 22, 24 and 26 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, these claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-7 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 1; Claims 9-14 are dependent from Claim 8 and are allowable therewith; and Claim 16 is dependent from Claim 15 and is allowable therewith. Similarly, Claims 18-20 are dependent from Claim 17 and are allowable therewith; and claims 23, 25 and 27 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claims 22, 24 and 26, respectively. The Examiner is, accordingly, respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-27, and to allow these claims.

Every effort has been made to place this case in condition for allowance, a notice of which is requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:gc